

LOGARITHMIC MEAN OSCILLATION ON THE POLYDISC, ENDPOINT RESULTS FOR MULTI-PARAMETER PARAPRODUCTS, AND COMMUTATORS ON BMO

SANDRA POTT AND BENOIT SEHBA

ABSTRACT. We study boundedness properties of a class of multiparameter paraproducts on the dual space of the dyadic Hardy space $H_d^1(\mathbb{T}^N)$, the dyadic product BMO space $\text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{T}^N)$. For this, we introduce a notion of logarithmic mean oscillation on the polydisc. We also obtain a result on the boundedness of iterated commutators on $\text{BMO}([0, 1]^2)$.

1. INTRODUCTION AND NOTATION

In recent years, multi-parameter paraproducts have generated much interest [1, 6, 9, 11], both in their own right and as building blocks for other operators, such as commutators and Hankel operators.

In this paper, we characterize boundedness of dyadic paraproducts on the endpoint spaces $\text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{T}^N)$ and $H_d^1(\mathbb{T}^N)$. Here, the spaces $H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and $\text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and their dyadic counterparts $\text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{T}^N)$ and $H_d^1(\mathbb{T}^N)$ on the polydisc are the product spaces in the sense of Chang and Fefferman [4].

Our main interest will be for the paraproduct denoted below by Π on the space $\text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{T}^N)$. We will prove a characterization of boundedness in terms of a natural notion of logarithmic mean oscillation in the polydisc.

We then apply the results on paraproducts to obtain a result on the boundedness of iterated commutators with the Hilbert transforms on compactly supported functions in $\text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^2)$. This is motivated by the classical one-parameter results in [8] on Hankel operators, or equivalently commutators with the Hilbert transform, on $\text{BMO}(\mathbb{T})$, and by the more recent results of Ferguson, Lacey and Terwilleger on iterated commutators with the Hilbert transforms on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N)$, see [6, 10].

The notion of logarithmic mean oscillation was originally introduced in the one-parameter setting for the characterization of multipliers of BMO and Toeplitz operators on H^1 [17, 19]. The corresponding multiparameter results, which rely on our results here, are the subject of a forthcoming paper [14].

The paraproduct denoted by Δ below and continuous analogues have been considered on $\text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{T}^N)$ and $\text{BMO}(\mathbb{T}^N)$ before, see [1, 9]. We restrict most

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 42B30, 42B37, Secondary: 42B20 .

Key words and phrases. Paraproduct, Haar basis, bounded mean oscillation, logarithmic mean oscillation.

The first author was supported by a Heisenberg fellowship of the German Research Foundation (DFG), the second author acknowledges funding from the “Irish Research Council for Science, Engineering and Technology”.

of our presentation to the two-dimensional case. As the general case follows in the same way, we will just give the corresponding results.

The paper is organised as follows. In Section 2, we prove the main technical results on the paraproduct Π . In Section 3, we give conditions on the boundedness of the other paraproducts. The general N -parameter case is treated in Section 4. In Section 5, we first consider paraproducts of functions on $\mathbb{R}^N$ rather than $\mathbb{T}^N$. For this, local versions of the results of Sections 2 and 3 are required. These results are then used to prove boundedness estimates for commutators with the so-called dyadic shift on product BMO^d . These in turn lead to a result on the boundedness of iterated commutators with the Hilbert transforms on a suitable product BMO space, by means of the decomposition of the Hilbert transform into dyadic shifts and new results on the relation between dyadic and continuous product BMO spaces.

Notation. Let $\mathbb{T}$ denote the unit circle. We identify $\mathbb{T}$ with the interval $[0, 1)$ in the usual way and write $\mathcal{D}$ for the set of all dyadic subintervals. We denote by $\mathcal{R}$ the set of all dyadic rectangles $R = I \times J$, where I and J in $\mathcal{D}$. Let h_I denote the Haar wavelet adapted to the dyadic interval I ,

$$h_I = |I|^{-1/2}(\chi_{I^+} - \chi_{I^-}),$$

where I^+ and I^- are the right and left halves of I , respectively.

For any rectangle $R \in \mathcal{R}$, the product Haar wavelet adapted to $R = I \times J = h_I \otimes h_J$ is defined by $h_R(s, t) = h_I(s)h_J(t)$. These wavelets form an orthonormal basis of

$$L_0^2(\mathbb{T}^2) = \left\{ f \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^2) : \int_{\mathbb{T}} f(s, t) dt = 0, \int_{\mathbb{T}} f(s, t) ds = 0 \text{ for a.e. } s, t \in \mathbb{T} \right\},$$

with

$$f = \sum_{R \in \mathcal{R}} \langle f, h_R \rangle h_R = \sum_{R \in \mathcal{R}} f_R h_R \quad (f \in L_0^2(\mathbb{T}^2)).$$

We will be writing $m_R f$ for the mean of $f \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)$ over the dyadic rectangle $R = I \times J$ and $f_R = f_{IJ}$ for the Haar coefficient $\langle f, h_R \rangle = \langle f, h_I \otimes h_J \rangle$.

The space of functions of dyadic bounded mean oscillations in $\mathbb{T}^2$, $\text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{T}^2)$, is the space of all function $b \in L_0^2(\mathbb{T}^2)$ such that

$$(1) \quad \|b\|_{\text{BMO}^d}^2 := \sup_{\Omega \subset \mathbb{T}^2} \frac{1}{|\Omega|} \sum_{R \in \Omega} |b_R|^2 = \sup_{\Omega \subset \mathbb{T}^2} \frac{1}{|\Omega|} \|P_\Omega b\|_2^2 < \infty,$$

where the supremum is taken over all open sets $\Omega \subset \mathbb{T}^2$ and P_Ω is the orthogonal projection on the subspace spanned by Haar functions h_R , $R \in \mathcal{R}$ and $R \subset \Omega$.

It is well-known (see e.g. [3], [1]) that $\text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{T}^2)$ is the dual space of the dyadic product Hardy space $H_d^1(\mathbb{T}^2)$ defined in terms of the dyadic square functions S .

That means,

$$H_d^1(\mathbb{T}^2) = \{f \in L_0^1(\mathbb{T}^2) : S[f] \in L^1(\mathbb{T}^2)\},$$

where

$$(2) \quad S[f] = \left(\sum_{R \in \mathcal{R}} \frac{\chi_R}{|R|} |f_R|^2 \right)^{1/2}.$$

For I a dyadic interval and $\varepsilon \in \{0, 1\}$, we define h_I^ε by

$$h_I^\varepsilon = \begin{cases} h_I & \text{if } \varepsilon = 0 \\ |I|^{-1/2} |h_I| & \text{if } \varepsilon = 1 \end{cases}$$

For $R = I \times J \in \mathcal{R}$ and $\vec{\varepsilon} = (\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)$, with $\varepsilon_j \in \{0, 1\}$, we write

$$h_R^{\vec{\varepsilon}} = h_I^{\varepsilon_1} \otimes h_J^{\varepsilon_2}.$$

We will consider operators of the following general form:

$$(3) \quad B_{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\delta}, \vec{\beta}}(\phi, f) := \sum_{R \in \mathcal{R}} \langle \phi, h_R^{\vec{\varepsilon}} \rangle \langle f, h_R^{\vec{\delta}} \rangle h_R^{\vec{\beta}}.$$

They appear naturally in the study of many other operators in complex analysis and harmonic analysis. In this note, we consider the paraproducts appearing as pieces of the usual product in the Haar expansion and corresponding to non-diagonal terms in this expansion. Some of the other operators of the form given in (3) on endpoint spaces appear in [14].

In other words, we consider here paraproducts $B_{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\delta}, \vec{\beta}}(\phi, \cdot)$ with symbol ϕ corresponding to triples $(\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\delta}, \vec{\beta})$ with $\vec{\varepsilon} = (0, 0)$ and

$$\delta_j = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \beta_j = 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

Finally, for simplicity, we can just denote the corresponding paraproducts by $\Pi^{\vec{\beta}}$. One easily sees that there are exactly four in dimension $N = 2$. We will occasionally use the notation $\vec{1} = (1, 1)$, $\vec{0} = (0, 0)$.

As usual, for $\vec{j} = (j_1, j_2) \in \mathbb{N}_0 \times \mathbb{N}_0$ we define the j_1 th generation of dyadic intervals and the j_2 th generation of dyadic rectangles,

$$\mathcal{D}_{j_1} = \{I \in \mathcal{D} : |I| = 2^{-j_1}\},$$

$$\mathcal{R}_{\vec{j}} = \mathcal{D}_{j_1} \times \mathcal{D}_{j_2} = \{I \times J \in \mathcal{R} : |I| = 2^{-j_1}, |J| = 2^{-j_2}\},$$

the product Haar martingale difference,

$$\Delta_{\vec{j}} f = \sum_{R \in \mathcal{R}_{\vec{j}}} \langle f, h_R \rangle h_R,$$

the expectations

$$E_{\vec{j}} f = \sum_{\vec{k} \in \mathbb{N}_0 \times \mathbb{N}_0, \vec{k} < \vec{j}} \Delta_{\vec{k}} f,$$

where we write $(k_1, k_2) = \vec{k} < \vec{j} = (j_1, j_2)$ for $k_1 < j_1$, $k_2 < j_2$ and correspondingly $(k_1, k_2) = \vec{k} \leq \vec{j} = (j_1, j_2)$ for $k_1 \leq j_1$, $k_2 \leq j_2$,

$$E_i^{(1)} f = \sum_{\vec{k} \in \mathbb{N}_0 \times \mathbb{N}_0, k_1 < i} \Delta_{\vec{k}} f,$$

and

$$E_j^{(2)} f = \sum_{\vec{k} \in \mathbb{N}_0 \times \mathbb{N}_0, k_2 < j} \Delta_{\vec{k}} f,$$

for $f \in L^2(\mathbb{T})$, $\vec{j} \in \mathbb{N}_0 \times \mathbb{N}_0$, $i, j \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

We will also require the operators on $L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)$ given by

$$(4) \quad Q_{\vec{j}} f = \sum_{\vec{k} \geq \vec{j}} \Delta_{\vec{k}} f$$

$$Q_i^{(1)} f = \sum_{\vec{k} \in \mathbb{N}_0 \times \mathbb{N}_0, k_1 \geq i} \Delta_{\vec{k}} f$$

$$Q_j^{(2)} f = \sum_{\vec{k} \in \mathbb{N}_0 \times \mathbb{N}_0, k_2 \geq j} \Delta_{\vec{k}} f.$$

Note that contrary to the one-parameter situation, $Q_{\vec{k}}$ is not the orthogonal complement of the expectation $E_{\vec{k}}$. In fact, we have the relation

$$(5) \quad f = E_{\vec{k}} f + E_{k_1}^{(1)} Q_{k_2}^{(2)} f + Q_{k_1}^{(1)} E_{k_2}^{(2)} f + Q_{\vec{k}} f \text{ for } \vec{k} \in \mathbb{N}_0 \times \mathbb{N}_0, f \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^2).$$

Let $\phi \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)$. The (main) paraproduct Π_ϕ is defined by

$$\Pi_\phi f = \Pi(\phi, f) := \sum_{\vec{j} \in \mathbb{N}_0 \times \mathbb{N}_0} (\Delta_{\vec{j}} \phi) (E_{\vec{j}} f) = \sum_{R \in \mathcal{R}} h_R \phi_R m_R f$$

on functions with finite Haar expansion. This is just the paraproduct $\Pi^{(0,0)}$ introduced above.

We will now define the space of functions of dyadic logarithmic mean oscillation on the bidisc, $\text{LMO}^d(\mathbb{T}^2)$.

DEFINITION 1.1. *Let $\phi \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)$. We say that $\phi \in \text{LMO}^d(\mathbb{T}^2)$, if there exists $C > 0$ with*

$$\|Q_{\vec{j}} \phi\|_{\text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{T}^2)} \leq C \frac{1}{(j_1 + 1)(j_2 + 1)}$$

for all $\vec{j} = (j_1, j_2) \in \mathbb{N}_0 \times \mathbb{N}_0$. The infimum of such constants is denoted by $\|\phi\|_{\text{LMO}^d}$.

An alternative characterization, which is closer in spirit to the one-parameter case, is the following:

PROPOSITION 1.2. *Let $\phi \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)$. Then $\phi \in \text{LMO}^d(\mathbb{T}^2)$, if and only if there exists $C > 0$ such that for each dyadic rectangle $R = I \times J$ and each open set $\Omega \subseteq R$,*

$$(6) \quad \frac{(\log \frac{4}{|I|})^2 (\log \frac{4}{|J|})^2}{|\Omega|} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{R}, Q \subseteq \Omega} |\phi_Q|^2 \leq C.$$

Proof. Let $\phi \in \text{LMO}^d(\mathbb{T}^2)$ in the sense of Definition 1.1, let $R = I \times J$ be a dyadic rectangle with $|I| = 2^{-j_1}$, $|J| = 2^{-j_2}$, and let $\Omega \subseteq R$ be open. Let

$\vec{j} = (j_1, j_2)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{R}, Q \subseteq \Omega} |\phi_Q|^2 &= \|P_\Omega \phi\|_2^2 = \|P_\Omega Q_{\vec{j}} \phi\|_2^2 \leq |\Omega| \|Q_{\vec{j}} \phi\|_{\text{BMO}^d}^2 \\ &\leq |\Omega| \frac{1}{(j_1+1)^2(j_2+1)^2} \|\phi\|_{\text{LMO}^d}^2 \lesssim (\log \frac{4}{|I|})^{-2} (\log \frac{4}{|J|})^{-2} |\Omega| \|\phi\|_{\text{LMO}^d}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Conversely, suppose that $\phi \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)$ and that (6) holds. Let $\vec{j} = (j_1, j_2) \in \mathbb{N}_0^2$, and let $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{T}^2$ open. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|P_\Omega Q_{\vec{j}} \phi\|_2^2 &= \sum_{R \in \mathcal{R}_j} \|P_{R \cap \Omega} Q_{\vec{j}} \phi\|_2^2 \\ &\lesssim C \frac{1}{(j_1+1)^2} \frac{1}{(j_2+1)^2} \sum_{R \in \mathcal{R}_j} |R \cap \Omega| = C \frac{1}{(j_1+1)^2(j_2+1)^2} |\Omega|. \end{aligned}$$

This holds for all $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{T}^2$ open, hence $\|Q_{\vec{j}} \phi\|_{\text{BMO}^d} \lesssim \frac{1}{(j_1+1)(j_2+1)}$. $\square$

2. THE MAIN PARAPRODUCT

Here is our main result of this section.

THEOREM 2.1. *Let $\phi \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)$. Then $\phi \in \text{LMO}^d(\mathbb{T}^2)$, if and only if $\Pi_\phi : \text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{T}^2) \rightarrow \text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{T}^2)$ is bounded, and $\|\Pi_\phi\|_{\text{BMO} \rightarrow \text{BMO}} \approx \|\phi\|_{\text{LMO}^d}$.*

Let us introduce some more notations. Given an integrable function f on $\mathbb{T}^2$ and intervals I and J in $\mathbb{T}$. We write $m_I f = \frac{1}{|I|} \int_I f(s, t) ds$, $m_J f = \frac{1}{|J|} \int_J f(s, t) dt$ and, $m_R f = \frac{1}{|R|} \int_R f(s, t) ds dt$, $R = I \times J$. We remark that $m_I f$ is in fact a function of the second variable while $m_J f$ is a function in the first variable. We will require the following lemma on the growth of averages and restrictions of functions in BMO.

LEMMA 2.2. *Let $b \in \text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{T}^2)$, $\vec{k} = (k_1, k_2) \in \mathbb{N}_0 \times \mathbb{N}_0$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} |m_R b| &\lesssim (k_1+1)(k_2+1) \|b\|_{\text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{T}^2)} \quad (R \in \mathcal{R}_{\vec{k}}); \\ \|m_I b\|_{\text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{T})} &\lesssim (k_1+1) \|b\|_{\text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{T}^2)} \quad (I \in \mathcal{D}_{k_1}); \\ \|\chi_R b\|_2^2 &\lesssim (k_1+1)^2 (k_2+1)^2 |R| \|b\|_{\text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{T}^2)}^2 \quad (R \in \mathcal{R}_{\vec{k}}); \\ \|\chi_I P_J b\|_2^2 &\lesssim (k_1+1)^2 |I| |J| \|b\|_{\text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{T}^2)}^2 \quad (R \in \mathcal{R}_{\vec{k}}); \end{aligned}$$

and this is sharp.

Proof. Let $R = I \times J$, $|I| = 2^{-k_1}$, $|J| = 2^{-k_2}$, $\vec{k} = (k_1, k_2)$, $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$. For the first inequality, consider

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{b \in \text{BMO}^d, \|b\|_{\text{BMO}^d} = 1} |m_R b| &= \sup_{b \in \text{BMO}^d, \|b\|_{\text{BMO}^d} = 1} |\langle b, \frac{\chi_R}{|R|} \rangle| \\ &\lesssim \left\| \frac{\chi_R}{|R|} \right\|_{H_d^1(\mathbb{T}^2)} \\ &= \left\| \frac{\chi_I}{|J|} \right\|_{H_d^1(\mathbb{T})} \left\| \frac{\chi_J}{|J|} \right\|_{H_d^1(\mathbb{T})} \\ &\lesssim \log\left(\frac{4}{|I|}\right) \log\left(\frac{4}{|J|}\right) \approx (k_1+1)(k_2+1), \end{aligned}$$

where we use the $H_d^1(\mathbb{T}^2)$ - $\text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{T}^2)$ duality in the first line and the known one-variable results in the last line.

For the second inequality, note that

$$\begin{aligned} \|m_I b\|_{\text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{T})} &\approx \sup_{f \in H_d^1(\mathbb{T}), \|f\|_{H_d^1} \leq 1} \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{1}{|I|} \chi_I(s) f(t) b(s, t) ds dt \right| \\ &\lesssim \|b\|_{\text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{T}^2)} \sup_{f \in H_d^1(\mathbb{T}), \|f\|_{H_d^1} \leq 1} \left\| \frac{1}{|I|} \chi_I(s) f(t) \right\|_{H_d^1(\mathbb{T}^2)} \\ &= \|b\|_{\text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{T}^2)} \left\| \frac{1}{|I|} \chi_I(s) \right\|_{H_d^1(\mathbb{T})} \lesssim (k_1 + 1) \|b\|_{\text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{T}^2)}. \end{aligned}$$

For the third inequality, write $\chi_R b(s, t) = P_R b(s, t) + \chi_R(s, t) m_I b(t) + \chi_R(s, t) m_J b(s) - \chi_R(s, t) m_R b$.

Clearly $\|P_R b\|_2^2 \leq |R| \|b\|_{\text{BMO}^d}^2$ and

$$\|\chi_R m_R b\|_2^2 = |m_R b|^2 |R| \lesssim (k_1 + 1)^2 (k_2 + 1)^2 |R| \|b\|_{\text{BMO}^d}^2$$

by the first inequality in Lemma 2.2. The results for the remaining terms follow from the one-dimensional John-Nirenberg inequality, since e. g.

$$\begin{aligned} \|\chi_R(s, t) m_I b(t)\|_2 &= |I|^{1/2} \|\chi_J(t) m_I b(t)\|_2 \\ &\lesssim |I|^{1/2} |J|^{1/2} (k_2 + 1) \|m_I b(t)\|_{\text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{T})} \\ &\lesssim |I|^{1/2} |J|^{1/2} (k_1 + 1) (k_2 + 1) \|b\|_{\text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{T}^2)} \end{aligned}$$

by the second inequality.

For the last inequality, note that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\chi_I(s) m_I(P_J b)\|_2^2 &= |I| \|m_I(P_J b)\|_2^2 \\ &\lesssim |I| |J| \|m_I b(t)\|_{\text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{T})}^2 \\ &\lesssim |I| |J| (k_1 + 1)^2 \|b\|_{\text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{T}^2)}^2 \end{aligned}$$

by the second inequality.

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \|\chi_I(s) P_J b\|_2 &\leq \|\chi_I(s) m_I(P_J b)\|_2 + \|P_{I \times J} b\|_2 \\ &\leq |I|^{1/2} |J|^{1/2} (k_1 + 1) \|b\|_{\text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{T}^2)} + |I|^{1/2} |J|^{1/2} \|b\|_{\text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{T}^2)} \\ &\lesssim |I|^{1/2} |J|^{1/2} (k_1 + 1) \|b\|_{\text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{T}^2)} \end{aligned}$$

by the second inequality.

Sharpness follows easily from the one-dimensional case, forming an appropriate product of $\text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{T})$ functions in the two different variables. $\square$

Next, for $\vec{k} \in \mathbb{N}_0 \times \mathbb{N}_0$ and $b \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)$, we consider the operator $\Pi_b E_{\vec{k}} = \Pi(b, E_{\vec{k}} \cdot)$ on $L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)$, given by

$$\Pi_b E_{\vec{k}} f = \Pi(b, E_{\vec{k}} f), \quad f \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^2).$$

LEMMA 2.3. *Let $b \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)$ and let $\vec{k} = (k_1, k_2) \in \mathbb{N}_0 \times \mathbb{N}_0$. Then*

$$\|\Pi_b E_{\vec{k}}\|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2} = \|\Pi(\sigma_{\vec{k}}(b), \cdot)\|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2},$$

where $\sigma_{\vec{k}} b$ is given by

$$(\sigma_{\vec{k}} b)_{I,J} = \begin{cases} b_{I,J} & \text{if } |I| > 2^{-k_1}, |J| > 2^{-k_2} \\ (\sum_{J' \subseteq J} |b_{I,J'}|^2)^{1/2} & \text{if } |I| > 2^{-k_1}, |J| = 2^{-k_2} \\ (\sum_{I' \subseteq I} |b_{I',J}|^2)^{1/2} & \text{if } |I| = 2^{-k_1}, |J| > 2^{-k_2} \\ (\sum_{I' \subseteq I, J' \subseteq J} |b_{I',J'}|^2)^{1/2} & \text{if } |I| = 2^{-k_1}, |J| = 2^{-k_2} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

In particular,

$$S^2[\sigma_{\vec{k}} b] = E_{\vec{k}} S^2[b],$$

where $S^2[b]$ denotes the square of the dyadic square function in (2), and

$$\|\sigma_{\vec{k}} b\|_2 = \|b\|_2.$$

Proof. Let $f \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Pi_b E_{\vec{k}} f\|^2 &= \left\| \sum_{\vec{j}} (\Delta_{\vec{j}} b) E_{\vec{j}} E_{\vec{k}} f \right\|^2 \\ &= \sum_{\vec{j} \geq \vec{k}} \|(\Delta_{\vec{j}} b) E_{\vec{k}} f\|^2 + \sum_{j_1 \geq k_1, j_2 < k_2} \|(\Delta_{\vec{j}} b) E_{(k_1, j_2)} f\|^2 \\ &\quad + \sum_{j_1 < k_1, j_2 \geq k_2} \|(\Delta_{\vec{j}} b) E_{(j_1, k_2)} f\|^2 + \sum_{\vec{j} < \vec{k}} \|(\Delta_{\vec{j}} b) E_{\vec{j}} f\|^2 \\ &= \left\| \left(\sum_{\vec{j} \geq \vec{k}} |\Delta_{\vec{j}} b|^2 \right)^{1/2} E_{\vec{k}} f \right\|^2 + \sum_{j_2 < k_2} \left\| \left(\sum_{j_1 \geq k_1} |\Delta_{\vec{j}} b|^2 \right)^{1/2} E_{(k_1, j_2)} f \right\|^2 \\ &\quad + \sum_{j_1 < k_1} \left\| \left(\sum_{j_2 \geq k_2} |\Delta_{\vec{j}} b|^2 \right)^{1/2} E_{(j_1, k_2)} f \right\|^2 + \sum_{\vec{j} < \vec{k}} \|(\Delta_{\vec{j}} b) E_{\vec{j}} f\|^2 \\ &= \left\| \sum_{\vec{j} \leq \vec{k}} \Delta_{\vec{j}} (\sigma_{\vec{k}} b) E_{\vec{j}} f \right\|^2 = \|\Pi(\sigma_{\vec{k}} b, f)\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

The remaining identities for $\sigma_{\vec{k}} b$ follow directly from the definition. $\square$

Here is our main technical lemma.

LEMMA 2.4. *Let $\phi, b \in \text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{T}^2)$ and $\vec{k} = (k_1, k_2) \in \mathbb{N}_0 \times \mathbb{N}_0$. Then*

$$\|\Pi(\Pi(\phi, b), E_{\vec{k}} \cdot)\|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2} \lesssim (k_1 + 1)(k_2 + 1) \|\phi\|_{\text{BMO}^d} \|b\|_{\text{BMO}^d}.$$

Proof. By Lemma 2.3, we have to estimate the BMO^d norm of $\sigma_{\vec{k}}(\Pi_\phi b) = \sigma_{\vec{k}}(\Pi(\phi, b))$. Clearly

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{\vec{k}}(\Pi_\phi b) &= \sigma_{\vec{k}}(E_{\vec{k}} \Pi_\phi b) + \sigma_{\vec{k}}(E_{k_1}^{(1)} Q_{k_2}^{(2)} \Pi_\phi b) + \sigma_{\vec{k}}(E_{k_2}^{(2)} Q_{k_1}^{(1)} \Pi_\phi b) + \sigma_{\vec{k}}(Q_{\vec{k}} \Pi_\phi b) \\ &= E_{\vec{k}} \Pi_\phi b + \sigma_{\vec{k}}(E_{k_1}^{(1)} Q_{k_2}^{(2)} \Pi_\phi b) + \sigma_{\vec{k}}(E_{k_2}^{(2)} Q_{k_1}^{(1)} \Pi_\phi b) + \sigma_{\vec{k}}(Q_{\vec{k}} \Pi_\phi b) = I + II + III + IV. \end{aligned}$$

(compare this decomposition to the one in the definition of $\sigma_{\vec{k}}$ in Lemma 2.3).

We start with term I. For any open set $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{T}^2$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{|\Omega|} \|P_\Omega E_{\vec{k}} \Pi_\phi b\|_2^2 &= \frac{1}{|\Omega|} \sum_{R=I \times J, |I| > 2^{-k_1}, |J| > 2^{-k_2}, R \subset \Omega} |\phi_R|^2 |m_R b|^2 \\ &\lesssim \frac{(k_1 + 1)^2 (k_2 + 1)^2}{|\Omega|} \sum_{R=I \times J, |I| > 2^{-k_1}, |J| > 2^{-k_2}, R \subset \Omega} |\phi_R|^2 \|b\|_{\text{BMO}^d}^2 \\ &\lesssim (k_1 + 1)^2 (k_2 + 1)^2 \|\phi\|_{\text{BMO}^d}^2 \|b\|_{\text{BMO}^d}^2. \end{aligned}$$

by Lemma 2.2.

For term II, note that since $\sigma_{\vec{k}}(E_{k_1}^{(1)} Q_{k_2}^{(2)} \Pi_\phi b)$ has only nontrivial Haar coefficients for those $R = I \times J$ with $|J| = 2^{-k_2}$ and $|I| > 2^{-k_1}$ (this corresponds to the second term in the definition of $\sigma_{\vec{k}}$ in Lemma 2.3), it is sufficient to check the BMO norm on rectangles $R = I \times J$ with $|J| = 2^{-k_2}$ and $|I| > 2^{-k_1}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{|R|} \|P_R \sigma_{\vec{k}}(E_{k_1}^{(1)} Q_{k_2}^{(2)} \Pi_\phi b)\|_2^2 &= \frac{1}{|R|} \sum_{I' \subseteq I} \left| \left(\sigma_{\vec{k}}(E_{k_1}^{(1)} Q_{k_2}^{(2)} \Pi_\phi b) \right)_{I', J} \right|^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{|R|} \sum_{I' \subseteq I, J' \subseteq J, I' \times J' \in \mathcal{R}} |\phi_{I' \times J'}|^2 |m_{I' \times J'} b|^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{|R|} \|\Pi_\phi \chi_R b\|_2^2 \lesssim \|\phi\|_{\text{BMO}^d}^2 \frac{1}{|R|} \|\chi_R b\|_2^2 \\ &\lesssim (k_1 + 1)^2 (k_2 + 1)^2 \|\phi\|_{\text{BMO}^d}^2 \|b\|_{\text{BMO}^d}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Term III is dealt with analogously. For term IV, note that since $\sigma_{\vec{k}}(Q_{\vec{k}} \Pi_\phi b)$ has only nontrivial Haar coefficient for $R \in \mathcal{R}_{\vec{k}}$, it is enough to check the BMO norm on rectangles of this type, and we obtain for $R = I \times J \in \mathcal{R}_{\vec{k}}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{|R|} \int_R |P_R \sigma_{\vec{k}}(Q_{\vec{k}} \Pi_\phi b)|^2 ds dt &\leq \frac{1}{|I||J|} \sum_{I' \subseteq I, J' \subseteq J} |\phi_{I' \times J'}|^2 |m_{I' \times J'} b|^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{|R|} \|\Pi_\phi \chi_R b\|_2^2 \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{|R|} \|\phi\|_{\text{BMO}^d}^2 \|\chi_R b\|_2^2 \\ &\lesssim (k_1 + 1)^2 (k_2 + 1)^2 \|\phi\|_{\text{BMO}^d}^2 \|b\|_{\text{BMO}^d}^2 \end{aligned}$$

by Lemma 2.2. □

In particular, we have

LEMMA 2.5. *Let $\phi \in \text{LMO}^d(\mathbb{T}^2)$, $b \in \text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{T}^2)$ and $\vec{k}, \vec{j} \in \mathbb{N}_0 \times \mathbb{N}_0$. Then*

$$\|\Pi \left(\Pi(Q_{\vec{j}} \phi, b), E_{\vec{k}} \cdot \right)\|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2} \lesssim \frac{|\vec{k} + \vec{1}|}{|\vec{j} + \vec{1}|} \|\phi\|_{\text{LMO}^d} \|b\|_{\text{BMO}^d},$$

where $|\vec{k} + \vec{1}| = (k_1 + 1)(k_2 + 1)$ and $|\vec{j} + \vec{1}| = (j_1 + 1)(j_2 + 1)$.

Proof. Definition 1.1 and Lemma 2.4. □

Proof. of Theorem 2.1. We begin by proving necessity. Suppose that $\Pi_\phi : \text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{T}^2) \rightarrow \text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{T}^2)$ is bounded. Let $R = I \times J$ be a dyadic rectangle, with $|I| = 2^{-k}$ and $|J| = 2^{-l}$, and let $\Omega \subseteq R$ be open. It is easy to see that there exists a function $b \in \text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{T}^2)$ with

$$b|_R \equiv (k+1)(l+1) \text{ and } \|b\|_{\text{BMO}^d} \leq C,$$

where C is a constant independent of R . Such a function can for example be found by forming the product $b_1 \otimes b_2$ of two one-variable functions b_1, b_2 , which have the corresponding properties for the intervals I and J , respectively. For details on the construction in the one-dimensional case, see e. g. [16]. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{(\log \frac{4}{|I|})^2 (\log \frac{4}{|J|})^2}{|\Omega|} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{R}, Q \subseteq \Omega} |\phi_Q|^2 &\approx \frac{(k+1)^2 (l+1)^2}{|\Omega|} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{R}, Q \subseteq \Omega} |\phi_Q|^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{|\Omega|} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{R}, Q \subseteq \Omega} |\phi_Q|^2 |m_Q b|^2 \leq \|\Pi_\phi b\|_{\text{BMO}^d}^2 \leq C^2 \|\Pi_\phi\|_{\text{BMO}^d \rightarrow \text{BMO}^d}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\phi \in \text{LMO}^d(\mathbb{T}^2)$ by Proposition 1.2, with the appropriate norm estimate.

To prove sufficiency of the LMO^d condition for boundedness of the paraproduct on BMO^d , let $\phi \in \text{LMO}^d(\mathbb{T}^2)$ and $b \in \text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{T}^2)$. We will estimate $\|\Pi_\phi b\|_{\text{BMO}^d} \approx \|\Pi_{\Pi(\phi, b)}\|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2} = \|\Pi(\Pi(\phi, b), \cdot)\|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2}$ by mean of Cotlar's Lemma, and use Lemma 2.5 to control off-diagonal decay.

For $N, K \in \mathbb{N}_0$, let

$$\begin{aligned} (7) \quad P_{N,K} &= \sum_{j_1=2^N-1}^{2^{N+1}-2} \sum_{j_2=2^K-1}^{2^{K+1}-2} \Delta_{\vec{j}}, \\ P^{N,K} &= \sum_{j_1=2^N-1}^{\infty} \sum_{j_2=2^K-1}^{\infty} \Delta_{\vec{j}}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$T_{N,K} = \Pi_{\Pi(\phi, b)} P_{N,K} = \Pi(\Pi(\phi, b), P_{N,K} \cdot).$$

That means, we wish to estimate the L^2 - L^2 operator norm of $\Pi(\Pi(\phi, b), \cdot) = \sum_{N,K=0}^{\infty} T_{N,K}$. Clearly $T_{N,K} T_{N',K'}^* = 0$ for $N \neq N'$ or $K \neq K'$. Therefore, we only have to estimate the norm of $T_{N,K}^* T_{N',K'}$ for $N, N', K, K' \in \mathbb{N}$. Letting $\bar{N} = \max\{N, N'\}$, $\underline{N} = \min\{N, N'\}$, $\bar{K} = \max\{K, K'\}$, $\underline{K} = \min\{K, K'\}$ and using the elementary identities

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi(\Pi(\phi, b), \cdot) P_{N,K} &= \Pi(\Pi(P^{N,K} \phi, b), \cdot) P_{N,K} \\ &= \Pi(P^{N,K} \Pi(\phi, b), \cdot) P_{N,K} = P^{N,K} \Pi(\Pi(\phi, b), \cdot) P_{N,K} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$P^{N,K} \Pi(\Pi(\phi, b), \cdot) = \Pi(\Pi(P^{N,K} \phi, b), \cdot),$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\|T_{N,K}^* T_{N',K'}\| &= \|P_{N,K} (\Pi(\Pi(\phi, b), \cdot))^* \Pi(\Pi(\phi, b), P_{N',K'} \cdot)\| \\
&= \|P_{N,K} \Pi(\Pi(\phi, b), \cdot))^* P^{N,K} P^{N',K'} \Pi(\Pi(\phi, b), \cdot) P_{N',K'}\| \\
&= \|P_{N,K} \Pi(\Pi(\phi, b), \cdot))^* P^{\overline{N}, \overline{K}} \Pi(\Pi(\phi, b), \cdot) P_{N',K'}\| \\
&= \|P_{N,K} \Pi(\Pi(P^{\overline{N}, \overline{K}} \phi, b), \cdot))^* \Pi(\Pi(P^{\overline{N}, \overline{K}} \phi, b), \cdot) P_{N',K'}\| \\
&\leq \|P_{N,K} \Pi(\Pi(P^{\overline{N}, \overline{K}} \phi, b), \cdot))^* \| \Pi(\Pi(P^{\overline{N}, \overline{K}} \phi, b), \cdot) P_{N',K'}\| \\
&\leq \|\Pi(\Pi(P^{\overline{N}, \overline{K}} \phi, b), P_{N,K} \cdot)\| \|\Pi(\Pi(P^{\overline{N}, \overline{K}} \phi, b), P_{N',K'} \cdot)\| \\
&\lesssim \frac{2^{N+1} 2^{K+1}}{2^{\overline{N}} 2^{\overline{K}}} \frac{2^{\overline{N}+1} 2^{\overline{K}+1}}{2^{\overline{N}} 2^{\overline{K}}} \|\phi\|_{\text{LMO}^d}^2 \|b\|_{\text{BMO}^d}^2 \\
&\lesssim 2^{-|N-N'|} 2^{-|K-K'|} \|\phi\|_{\text{LMO}^d}^2 \|b\|_{\text{BMO}^d}^2
\end{aligned}$$

by Lemma 2.5. In particular, the $T_{N,K}$ are uniformly bounded in norm, and there exists a positive sequence $(\alpha(i, j))_{i,j \geq 0}$ with

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^{\infty} \alpha(i, j)^{1/2} < \infty$$

such that

$$\|T_{N,K}^* T_{N',K'}\| \leq \alpha(|N - N'|, |K - K'|) \|\phi\|_{\text{LMO}^d}^2 \|b\|_{\text{BMO}^d}^2.$$

Thus, by Cotlar's Lemma, $T = \Pi(\Pi(\phi, b), \cdot)$ is bounded, and there exists an absolute constant $C > 0$ with

$$\|\Pi(\Pi(\phi, b), \cdot)\| \leq C \|\phi\|_{\text{LMO}^d} \|b\|_{\text{BMO}^d}.$$

Hence

$$\|\Pi(\phi, b)\|_{\text{BMO}^d} \leq C \|\phi\|_{\text{LMO}^d} \|b\|_{\text{BMO}^d}.$$

□

In the previous theorem, sharp estimates of L^2 norms of restrictions of BMO functions to rectangles were required. We do not know such sharp estimates for restrictions of BMO functions to general open sets:

QUESTION 2.6. *By duality,*

$$|m_{\Omega} b| \lesssim \left\| \frac{\chi_{\Omega}}{|\Omega|} \right\|_{H_d^1(\mathbb{T}^2)} \|b\|_{\text{BMO}^d}, \quad b \in \text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{T}^2)$$

for all open sets Ω , and this is sharp for each individual set Ω .

Is it true that “estimates for p -norms are no worse than the estimate for the average $m_{\Omega} b$ ”, i. e.

$$\|\chi_{\Omega} b\|_p^p \lesssim \left\| \frac{\chi_{\Omega}}{|\Omega|} \right\|_{H_d^1(\mathbb{T}^2)}^p |\Omega| \quad \text{for } 1 < p < \infty?$$

The John-Nirenberg Theorem [3] gives

$$\|\chi_{\Omega} b\|_p^p \lesssim \log\left(\frac{4}{|\Omega|}\right)^{2p} |\Omega|,$$

which is easily seen to be not sharp for certain sets Ω (for example by considering “long thin” rectangles and using Lemma 2.2).

3. THE OTHER PARAPRODUCTS

There are four dyadic paraproducts in two variables, namely the paraproduct $\Pi = \Pi^{(0,0)}$ discussed above, its adjoint defined by

$$\Pi^{(1,1)}(\phi, f) = \Delta_\phi f = \Delta(\phi, f) = \sum_{R \in \mathcal{R}} \frac{\chi_R}{|R|} \phi_R f_R,$$

and the mixed paraproducts given by

$$\Pi^{(1,0)}(\phi, f) = \sum_{I \times J \in \mathcal{R}} \frac{\chi_I(s)}{|I|} h_J(t) \phi_{I \times J} m_J f_I,$$

$$\Pi^{(0,1)}(\phi, f) = \sum_{I \times J \in \mathcal{R}} h_I(s) \frac{\chi_J(t)}{|J|} \phi_{I \times J} m_I f_J,$$

see [1]. Here and in the following, the variables are sometimes included to explain dependency on the different variables rather than to indicate pointwise equality.

Interestingly, all four paraproducts have a different boundedness behaviour on $\text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{T}^2)$.

DEFINITION 3.1. *Let $\phi \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)$. We say that $\phi \in \text{LMO}_1^d(\mathbb{T}^2)$, if there exists $C > 0$ with*

$$\|Q_i^{(1)} \phi\|_{\text{BMO}^d} \leq C \frac{1}{i+1}$$

for all $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

We say that $\phi \in \text{LMO}_2^d(\mathbb{T}^2)$, if there exists $C > 0$ with

$$\|Q_j^{(2)} \phi\|_{\text{BMO}^d} \leq C \frac{1}{j+1}$$

for all $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$. The infimum of such constants is denoted by $\|\phi\|_{\text{LMO}_1^d}$, $\|\phi\|_{\text{LMO}_2^d}$, respectively.

THEOREM 3.2. *Let $\phi \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)$. Then*

- (1) $\Delta_\phi : \text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{T}^2) \rightarrow \text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{T}^2)$ is bounded, if and only if $\phi \in \text{BMO}^d$.
Moreover, $\|\Delta_\phi\|_{\text{BMO}^d \rightarrow \text{BMO}^d} \approx \|\phi\|_{\text{BMO}^d}$.
- (2) $\Pi^{(0,1)}(\phi, \cdot) : \text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{T}^2) \rightarrow \text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{T}^2)$ is bounded, if $\phi \in \text{LMO}_1^d(\mathbb{T}^2)$.
Moreover, $\|\Pi^{(0,1)}(\phi, \cdot)\|_{\text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{T}^2) \rightarrow \text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{T}^2)} \lesssim \|\phi\|_{\text{LMO}_1^d(\mathbb{T}^2)}$.
- (3) $\Pi^{(1,0)}(\phi, \cdot) : \text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{T}^2) \rightarrow \text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{T}^2)$ is bounded, if $\phi \in \text{LMO}_2^d(\mathbb{T}^2)$.
Moreover, $\|\Pi^{(1,0)}(\phi, \cdot)\|_{\text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{T}^2) \rightarrow \text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{T}^2)} \lesssim \|\phi\|_{\text{LMO}_2^d(\mathbb{T}^2)}$.

Proof. (1) was shown in [1]. To show (2), we will follow a simplified version of the ideas of the proof of Theorem 2.1.

LEMMA 3.3. *Let $b \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)$ and let $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then*

$$\|\Pi_b E_k^{(1)}\|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2} = \|\Pi_{\sigma_k^{(1)} b}\|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2},$$

where

$$(\sigma_k^{(1)} b)_{I,J} = \begin{cases} b_{I,J} & \text{if } |I| > 2^{-k} \\ (\sum_{I' \subseteq I} |b_{I',J}|^2)^{1/2} & \text{if } |I| = 2^{-k} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Proof. As in Lemma 2.3. □

It remains to prove the following.

LEMMA 3.4. *Let $\phi, b \in \text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{T}^2)$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then*

$$\|\Pi\left(\Pi^{(0,1)}(\phi, b), E_k^{(1)} \cdot\right)\|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2} \lesssim (k+1)\|\phi\|_{\text{BMO}^d}\|b\|_{\text{BMO}^d}.$$

Proof. We write E for $E^{(1)}$, and σ for $\sigma^{(1)}$. Following the results in Lemma 3.3, we estimate

$$\|\sigma_k(\Pi^{(0,1)}(\phi, b))\|_{\text{BMO}^d} \leq \|\sigma_k(\Pi^{(0,1)}(E_k\phi, b))\|_{\text{BMO}^d} + \|\sigma_k(\Pi^{(0,1)}(Q_k\phi, b))\|_{\text{BMO}^d}.$$

We start with the second term. Since $\Pi^{(0,1)}(Q_k\phi, b)$ has no nontrivial Haar terms in the first variable for intervals I with $|I| > 2^{-k}$,

$$\sigma_k(\Pi^{(0,1)}(Q_k\phi, b)) = \sum_{J \in \mathcal{D}} \sum_{|I|=2^{-k}} h_I(s) \left(\sum_{I' \subseteq I} |\phi_{I'J}|^2 |m_{I'} b_J|^2 \right)^{1/2} \frac{\chi_J}{|J|}(t),$$

and this has only nontrivial Haar terms in the first variable for intervals I with $|I| = 2^{-k}$. As before, the BMO^d condition now only has to be considered on rectangles of the form $R = I \times J$, $|I| = 2^{-k}$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \|P_R \sigma_k(\Pi^{(0,1)}(Q_k\phi, b))\|_2^2 &= \|P_R \sigma_k(\Pi^{(0,1)}(P_R Q_k\phi, b))\|_2^2 \\ &\leq \|\sigma_k(\Pi^{(0,1)}(P_R Q_k\phi, b))\|_2^2 \\ &= \|\Pi^{(0,1)}(P_R Q_k\phi, b)\|_2^2 \\ &= \|\Pi^{(0,1)}(P_R \phi, \chi_I(s) P_J b)\|_2^2 \\ &\lesssim \|P_R \phi\|_{\text{BMO}^d} \|\chi_I P_J b\|_2^2 \\ &\lesssim (k+1)^2 |R| \|\phi\|_{\text{BMO}^d}^2 \|b\|_{\text{BMO}^d}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Now we have to deal with the first term $\|\sigma_k(\Pi^{(1,0)}(E_k\phi, b))\|_{\text{BMO}^d}$. Let $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{T}^2$ be open and write $\mathcal{J}_I = \cup_{J \in \mathcal{D}, I \times J \subseteq \Omega} J$ for $I \in \mathcal{D}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|P_\Omega \left(\sigma_k(\Pi^{(0,1)}(\phi, b)) \right)\|_2^2 &= \|P_\Omega \sigma_k(\Pi^{(0,1)}(P_\Omega E_k\phi, b))\|_2^2 \\ &\leq \|\sigma_k(\Pi^{(0,1)}(P_\Omega E_k\phi, b))\|_2^2 = \|\Pi^{(0,1)}(P_\Omega E_k\phi, b)\|_2^2 \\ &= \left\| \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}, |I| > 2^{-k}} \sum_{J \in \mathcal{D}: I \times J \subseteq \Omega} h_I(s) \frac{\chi_J}{|J|}(t) \phi_{IJ} m_I b_J \right\|_2^2 \\ &= \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}, |I| > 2^{-k}} \left\| \sum_{J \subseteq \mathcal{J}_I} \frac{\chi_J}{|J|}(t) \phi_{IJ} m_I b_J \right\|_2^2 \\ &= \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}, |I| > 2^{-k}} \|\Delta_{m_I b} P_{\mathcal{J}_I} \phi_I\|_2^2 \\ &\lesssim \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}, |I| > 2^{-k}} \|m_I b\|_{\text{BMO}^d}^2 \|P_{\mathcal{J}_I} \phi_I\|_2^2 \\ &\lesssim (k+1)^2 \|b\|_{\text{BMO}^d}^2 \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}} \|P_{\mathcal{J}_I} \phi_I\|_2^2 \\ &\lesssim (k+1)^2 \|b\|_{\text{BMO}^d}^2 \|P_\Omega \phi\|_2^2 \\ &\lesssim (k+1)^2 \|b\|_{\text{BMO}^d}^2 \|\phi\|_{\text{BMO}^d}^2 |\Omega| \end{aligned}$$

by Lemma 2.2. $\square$

As in the last section, we immediately deduce

$$(8) \quad \|\Pi\left(\Pi^{(0,1)}(Q_j^{(1)}\phi, b), E_k^{(1)}\cdot\right)\|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2} \lesssim \frac{k+1}{j+1} \|\phi\|_{\text{LMO}_1^d} \|b\|_{\text{BMO}^d}.$$

The remainder of the proof of (2) is now exactly analogous to the proof of Theorem 2.1, defining $T_N = \Pi(\Pi^{(0,1)}(\phi, \cdot), P_N \cdot)$, where $P_N = \sum_{i=2^N-1}^{2^{N+1}-2} \Delta_i^{(1)}$, and using Cotlar's Lemma in one parameter. Finally, (3) follows by simply switching variables. $\square$

4. GENERALIZATION TO MORE THAN TWO VARIABLES

The results of Section 2 and 3 generalize easily to more than two variables. We will just state the results here, the proofs are very similar to those in the previous sections.

Let $N \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\mathcal{R} = \{R = R_1 \times \cdots \times R_N \in \mathbb{T}^N : R_j \in \mathcal{D}\}$ the N -fold Cartesian product of the set of dyadic intervals $\mathcal{D}$, and let $(h_R)_{R \in \mathcal{R}}$ denote the corresponding product Haar basis of $L_0^2(\mathbb{T}^N)$. Recall that a function $b \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^N)$ is in the dyadic product BMO space $\text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{T}^N)$, if

$$\|b\|_{\text{BMO}^d}^2 = \sup_{\Omega \in \mathbb{T}^N_{\text{open}}} \frac{1}{|\Omega|} \sum_{R \subset \Omega} |b_R|^2 < \infty.$$

DEFINITION 4.1. Let $\phi \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^N)$, $\vec{\delta} = (\delta_1, \dots, \delta_N)$, $\delta_j \in \{0, 1\}$. Then $\phi \in \text{LMO}_{\vec{\delta}}^d(\mathbb{T}^N)$, if and only if there exists $C > 0$ such that for each dyadic rectangle $R = R_1 \times R_2 \times \cdots \times R_N \in \mathcal{D}^N$ and each open set $\Omega \subseteq R$,

$$\frac{\log(\frac{4}{|R_{\delta_1}|})^2 \cdots \log(\frac{4}{|R_{\delta_N}|})^2}{|\Omega|} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{R}, Q \subseteq \Omega} |\phi_Q|^2 \leq C,$$

where

$$R_{\delta_j} = \begin{cases} R_j & \text{if } \delta_j = 0 \\ \mathbb{T} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

When $\vec{\delta} = \vec{0} = (0, \dots, 0)$, $\text{LMO}_{\vec{\delta}}^d(\mathbb{T}^N)$ corresponds to the generalization of $\text{LMO}^d(\mathbb{T}^2)$ and is denoted by $\text{LMO}^d(\mathbb{T}^N)$. One easily sees that for $\vec{\delta} = (1, \dots, 1) = \vec{1}$, the corresponding space is just the space $\text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{T}^N)$.

As before, we consider paraproducts as defined in (3) for triples $(\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\delta}, \vec{\beta})$ with $\vec{\varepsilon} = (0, \dots, 0)$, and

$$\delta_j = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \beta_j = 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

For simplicity, we write

$$(9) \quad \Pi_{\vec{\phi}}^{\vec{\beta}} f = B_{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\delta}, \vec{\beta}}(\phi, f) := \sum_{R \in \mathcal{R}} \phi_R \langle f, h_R^{\vec{\delta}} \rangle h_R^{\vec{\beta}}.$$

As in the case $N = 2$, Π and Δ are given by $\Pi^{\vec{\beta}}$ for $\vec{\beta} = (0, \dots, 0)$ and $\vec{\beta} = (1, \dots, 1)$, respectively.

Here is the result on the boundedness of $\Pi_{\vec{\phi}}^{\vec{\beta}}$ on $\text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{T}^N)$.

THEOREM 4.2. *Let $\phi \in L_0^2(\mathbb{T}^N)$, $\vec{\beta} = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n)$, $\beta_j \in \{0, 1\}$. Then*

- (1) $\Pi_\phi^{(0, \dots, 0)} = \Pi_\phi : \text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{T}^N) \rightarrow \text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{T}^N)$ *is bounded, if and only if $\phi \in \text{LMO}^d(\mathbb{T}^N)$. Moreover,*

$$\|\Pi_\phi\|_{\text{BMO}^d \rightarrow \text{BMO}^d} \approx \|\phi\|_{\text{LMO}^d}.$$

- (2) $\Pi_\phi^{(1, \dots, 1)} = \Delta_\phi : \text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{T}^N) \rightarrow \text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{T}^N)$ *is bounded, if and only if $\phi \in \text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{T}^N)$. Moreover,*

$$\|\Delta_\phi\|_{\text{BMO}^d \rightarrow \text{BMO}^d} \approx \|\phi\|_{\text{BMO}^d}.$$

- (3) *For $\vec{\beta} \neq (0, \dots, 0), (1, \dots, 1)$, $\Pi_\phi^{\vec{\beta}} : \text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{T}^N) \rightarrow \text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{T}^N)$ is bounded if $\phi \in \text{LMO}_{\vec{\beta}}^d(\mathbb{T}^N)$. Moreover,*

$$\|\Pi_\phi^{\vec{\beta}}\|_{\text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{T}^N) \rightarrow \text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{T}^N)} \lesssim \|\phi\|_{\text{LMO}_{\vec{\beta}}^d}.$$

5. HANKEL OPERATORS, COMMUTATORS AND DYADIC SHIFTS

In this section, we are interested in application of the previous results to boundedness of iterated commutators with Hilbert transform on $H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$, i.e the predual of $\text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ as defined by A. Chang and R. Fefferman [3]. Again, for simplicity, we restrict our presentation to the two dimensional case, as the general case follows the same way.

We will be writing H_1 and H_2 for the Hilbert transform in the first and second variable respectively. Let us first recall the following result.

THEOREM 5.1 ([3, 5, 6]). *Let $b \in \text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^2)$. Then*

$$[H_1, [H_2, \phi]] : L^2(\mathbb{R}^2) \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$$

is bounded, and $\|[H_1, [H_2, \phi]]\|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2} \approx \|\phi\|_{\text{BMO}}$.

One would like to characterize boundedness of commutators on the end-point spaces $H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and $\text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ in an analogous fashion in terms of a suitable notion of $\text{LMO}(\mathbb{R}^2)$. However, this is not possible even in one parameter (see e. g. [8], Remark 4.1). The reason is the slow decay of the kernel $1/x$ of the Hilbert transform. This means that for ϕ with compact support and $f \in H^1(\mathbb{R})$ an atom, ϕHf will be integrable, but ϕf will in general not have average zero, so $H(\phi f)$ behaves like $1/x$ at ∞ and is therefore not integrable at ∞ . On the dual side, this amounts to saying that one should only consider functions with compact support in $\text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^2)$.

In terms of our main result on paraproducts Theorem 2.1, one sees easily that there is no good estimate for averages of $\text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{R})$ functions, and the theorem does not hold for $\text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{R}^2)$. However, we will prove a local estimates for paraproducts and commutators. Our tools are adapted for the case of $\mathbb{R}^N$. It would be interesting to see the result in the case of the polydisc.

Let

$$(10) \quad \text{BMO}([0, 1]^2) := \{f \in \text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^2) : \text{supp } f \subseteq [0, 1]^2\}.$$

and

$$\text{BMO}^d([0, 1]^2) = \{f \in \text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{R}^2) : \text{supp } f \subseteq [0, 1]^2\}.$$

We say that $f \in \text{LMO}^d([0, 1]^2)$, if $f \in \text{BMO}^d([0, 1]^2)$ and there exists $C > 0$ with

$$\|Q_{\vec{k}}f\|_{\text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{R}^2)} \leq C \frac{1}{(k_1 + 1)(k_2 + 1)} \text{ for } \vec{k} = (k_1, k_2) \in \mathbb{N}_0 \times \mathbb{N}_0.$$

The spaces $\text{LMO}_{\vec{\beta}}^d([0, 1]^2)$ are defined correspondingly. Here are our local estimates on paraproducts.

THEOREM 5.2. *Let $\phi \in L_0^2([0, 1]^2)$, $\vec{\beta} = (\beta_1, \beta_2)$, $\beta_j \in \{0, 1\}$. Then*

- (1) $\Pi_{\phi}^{(0,0)} = \Pi_{\phi} : \text{BMO}^d([0, 1]^2) \rightarrow \text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{R}^2)$ is bounded, if and only if $\phi \in \text{LMO}^d([0, 1]^2)$. Moreover,

$$\|\Pi_{\phi}\|_{\text{BMO}^d([0,1]^2) \rightarrow \text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{R}^2)} \approx \|\phi\|_{\text{LMO}^d([0,1]^2)}.$$

- (2) $\Pi_{\phi}^{(1,1)} = \Delta_{\phi} : \text{BMO}^d([0, 1]^2) \rightarrow \text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{R}^2)$ is bounded, if and only if $\phi \in \text{BMO}^d([0, 1]^2)$. Moreover,

$$\|\Delta_{\phi}\|_{\text{BMO}^d([0,1]^2) \rightarrow \text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{R}^2)} \approx \|\phi\|_{\text{BMO}^d([0,1]^2)}.$$

- (3) For $\vec{\beta} \neq (0, 0), (1, 1)$,
 $\Pi_{\phi}^{\vec{\beta}} : \text{BMO}^d([0, 1]^2) \rightarrow \text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{R}^2)$ is bounded if $\phi \in \text{LMO}_{\vec{\beta}}^d([0, 1]^2)$.
 Moreover,

$$\|\Pi^{\vec{\beta}}\phi\|_{\text{BMO}^d([0,1]^2) \rightarrow \text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{R}^2)} \lesssim \|\phi\|_{\text{LMO}_{\vec{\beta}}^d([0,1]^2)}^2.$$

The theorem relies only on the appropriate version of Lemma 2.2, and a slight change of the decomposition of the identity in the proofs of Theorem 2.1 and 3.2.

LEMMA 5.3. *For a bounded (not necessarily dyadic) interval $I \subset \mathbb{R}$, let*

$$s(I) = \begin{cases} \log |I|^{-1} + 1 & \text{for } |I| \leq 1 \\ 1 & \text{for } |I| > 1. \end{cases}$$

For a bounded (not necessarily dyadic) axis-parallel rectangle $R = I \times J \subset \mathbb{R}^2$, let $s(R) = s(I)s(J)$.

Then for each $b \in \text{BMO}([0, 1]^2)$ and each rectangle $R = I \times J \subset \mathbb{R}^2$,

(1)

$$|m_R b| \lesssim s(R) \|b\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^2)};$$

(2)

$$\|m_I b\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbb{R})} \lesssim s(I) \|b\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^2)};$$

(3)

$$\|\chi_R b\|_2^2 \lesssim s(R)^2 |R| \|b\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^2)}^2;$$

(4)

$$\|\chi_I P_J b\|_2^2 \lesssim s(I)^2 |I| |J| \|b\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^2)}^2$$

(5)

$$\|\chi_I m_J b\|_2^2 \lesssim s(J)^2 s(I)^2 |I| \|b\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^2)}^2$$

and this is sharp. Here, $P_J b(s, t) = \chi_J(t)(b(s, t) - m_J b(s))$.

Before proving this lemma, let us first turn to the relation of $\text{BMO}([0, 1]^2)$, $\text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^2)$, $\text{BMO}(\mathbb{T}^2)$, and $\text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{R}^2)$.

First let us consider the relation between $\text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and $\text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{R}^2)$. This was clarified only quite recently in [13], [18]. Given $\alpha = (\alpha_j)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ and $r \in [1, 2)$, we denote by $\mathcal{D}^{\alpha, r} = r\mathcal{D}^\alpha$ the dilated and translated standard dyadic grid $\mathcal{D}$ of $\mathbb{R}$ in the sense of [7]. For $\vec{\alpha} = (\alpha^1, \alpha^2) \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}} \times \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ and $\vec{r} = (r_1, r_2) \in [1, 2)^2$, we define $\mathcal{D}^{\vec{\alpha}, \vec{r}}$ to be the dilated and translated product dyadic grid in $\mathbb{R}^2$. That is $Q = Q_1 \times Q_2 \in \mathcal{D}^{\vec{\alpha}, \vec{r}}$ if $Q_1 \in r_1\mathcal{D}^{\alpha^1}$ and $Q_2 \in r_2\mathcal{D}^{\alpha^2}$. The work in [13], [18] implies in particular that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^2) &= \bigcap_{\vec{\alpha} \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}} \times \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}, \vec{r} \in [1, 2)^2} \text{BMO}^{d, \vec{\alpha}, \vec{r}}(\mathbb{R}^2) \\ &= \bigcap_{\vec{\alpha} \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}} \times \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}} \text{BMO}^{d, \vec{\alpha}, \vec{r}_0}(\mathbb{R}^2) \text{ for any } \vec{r}_0 \in [0, 1)^2, \end{aligned}$$

where $\text{BMO}^{d, \vec{\alpha}, \vec{r}}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ is the dyadic $\text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ defined with respect to the product dyadic grid $\mathcal{D}^{\vec{\alpha}, \vec{r}}$. One also obtains that

$$\text{BMO}([0, 1]^2) = \bigcap_{\vec{\alpha} \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}} \times \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}, \vec{r} \in [1, 2)^2} \text{BMO}^{d, \vec{\alpha}, \vec{r}}([0, 1]^2).$$

Now let us consider the relationship between $\text{BMO}([0, 1]^2)$ and $\text{BMO}(\mathbb{T}^2)$. It is easy to see that under the usual identification of $[0, 1)$ and $\mathbb{T}$, $\text{BMO}([0, 1]^2) \neq \text{BMO}(\mathbb{T}^2)$. A simple example is the function

$$b(s, t) = \log(\min(s, 1 - s)) \cdot \log(\min(t, 1 - t)) \quad (s, t) \in [0, 1]^2,$$

which is in $\text{BMO}(\mathbb{T}^2)$, but not in $\text{BMO}([0, 1]^2)$.

On the other hand, for each $a < 0$, $b > 1$, we can extend $b \in \text{BMO}([0, 1]^2)$ to a doubly $(b - a)$ -periodic function in $\text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^2)$, by first considering it as a function on $[a, b]^2$ and then extending this function doubly periodically. Of course the subspace of doubly 1-periodic functions in $\text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ can be identified with $\text{BMO}(\mathbb{T}^2)$, and for any $b > a$, the subspace of doubly $b - a$ periodic functions in $\text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ can be identified with $\text{BMO}(\mathbb{T}^2)$ by means of an appropriate dilation.

Proof. of Lemma 5.3. The proof follows mostly from Lemma 2.2, but we have to attend to a few technicalities. Let $R = I \times J$ be a rectangle. We only need to consider the case that $I \times J \cap [0, 1]^2 \neq \emptyset$, that is $I \cap [0, 1] \neq \emptyset$ and $J \cap [0, 1] \neq \emptyset$. If $|I|, |J| \leq 1$, then $R \cup [0, 1]^2 \subset [-1, 2]^2$. By first considering the functions in $\text{BMO}([0, 1]^2)$ as functions on $[-1, 2)$, then extending doubly periodically with period 3 and identifying the space of doubly periodic functions with period 3 in $\text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ with $\text{BMO}(\mathbb{T}^2)$, we can apply Lemma 2.2 to obtain the desired estimates (1) - (5). Note that (5), which didn't appear explicitly in Lemma 2.2, is a simple consequence of (2) and (3), applied for the one-dimensional case.

Then (1) is obtained in general by writing $I' = I \cap [0, 1]$, $J' = J \cap [0, 1]$ and observing that $|I'|s(I'), |J'|s(J') < 2$, which yields

$$\begin{aligned} |m_{I \times J} b| &= \frac{|I'|}{|I|} \frac{|J'|}{|J|} |m_{I' \times J'} b| \leq \frac{|I'|}{|I|} \frac{|J'|}{|J|} s(I') s(J') \|b\|_{\text{BMO}} \\ &\lesssim s(I) s(J) \|b\|_{\text{BMO}} \quad \text{for } |I|, |J| > 1 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} |m_{I \times J} b| &= \frac{|I'|}{|I|} |m_{I' \times J} b| \leq \frac{|I'|}{|I|} s(I') s(J) \|b\|_{\text{BMO}} \\ &\lesssim s(I) s(J) \|b\|_{\text{BMO}} \quad \text{for } |I| > 1 \text{ and } |J| \leq 1. \end{aligned}$$

To get estimate (2) in case $|I| \leq 1$, we need to check boundedness of $\frac{1}{|J|^{1/2}} \|P_J m_I b\|_2$ for arbitrary intervals J with $J \cap [0, 1] \neq \emptyset$. For $|J| \leq 1$, we get the desired estimate as above. For $|J| > 1$, write $J' = J \cap [0, 1]$, $J'' = J \cap [0, 1]^c$ and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &P_J m_I b(t) \\ &= \chi_J(t) (m_I b(t) - m_{I \times J} b) \\ (11) \quad &= \chi_{J'}(t) \left(m_I b(t) - \frac{|J'|}{|J|} m_{I \times J'} b \right) - \chi_{J''}(t) \frac{|J'|}{|J|} m_{I \times J'} b \\ &= \chi_{J'}(t) (m_I b(t) - m_{I \times J} b) + \chi_{J'}(t) \frac{|J''|}{|J|} m_{I \times J'} b - \chi_{J''}(t) \frac{|J'|}{|J|} m_{I \times J'} b. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \|P_J m_I b(t)\|_2 &\leq \|\chi_{J'}(m_I b(t) - m_{I \times J} b)\|_2 \\ &\quad + \|\chi_{J'}(t) \frac{|J''|}{|J|} m_{I \times J'} b\|_2 + \|\chi_{J''}(t) \frac{|J'|}{|J|} m_{I \times J'} b\|_2. \end{aligned}$$

The first summand is estimated by the previous argument for the case $|J| \leq 1$. For the second and third summand, we observe that by (1),

$$|m_{I \times J'} b| \lesssim s(I) s(J') \|b\|_{\text{BMO}}$$

and consequently, as $|J'| \leq 1$,

$$\|\chi_{J'}(t) \frac{|J''|}{|J|} m_{I \times J'} b\|_2 \lesssim \frac{|J'|^{1/2} |J''|}{|J|} s(I) s(J') \|b\|_{\text{BMO}} \lesssim s(I) \|b\|_{\text{BMO}}$$

and

$$\|\chi_{J''}(t) \frac{|J'|}{|J|} m_{I \times J'} b\|_2 \lesssim \frac{|J''|^{1/2} |J'|}{|J|} s(I) s(J') \|b\|_{\text{BMO}} \lesssim s(I) \|b\|_{\text{BMO}}.$$

Now consider the case $|I| > 1$, $I \cap [0, 1] \neq \emptyset$. Similarly to the above, let $I' = I \cap [0, 1]$. Writing $m_I b = \frac{|I'|}{|I|} m_{I'} b$, we obtain the same result.

It will be useful for the further estimates to prove (5) at this point. It is clear for $|I|, |J| \leq 1$, otherwise

$$\begin{aligned} \|\chi_I m_J b\|_2^2 &= \frac{|J'|^2}{|J|^2} \|\chi_{I'} m_{J'} b\|_2^2 \lesssim \frac{|J'|^2}{|J|^2} s(J')^2 |I'| s(I')^2 \|b\|_{\text{BMO}}^2 \\ &\lesssim s(J)^2 s(I)^2 |I| \|b\|_{\text{BMO}}^2. \end{aligned}$$

For (3), write for $R = I \times J$

$$\chi_R b = P_R b + \chi_R m_I b + \chi_R m_J b - \chi_R m_R b$$

and use (1) and (5).

For (4), write

$$\chi_I(s) P_J b(s, t) = \chi_I(s) \chi_J(t) b(s, t) - \chi_I(s) m_J b(s)$$

and use (3) and (5). $\square$

Proof. of Theorem 5.2. We only prove the assertion (1). The proof for the other paraproducts uses the same ideas combined with those in the proof of Theorem 3.2.

We want to prove that given $\phi \in \text{LMO}^d([0, 1]^2)$, $b \in \text{BMO}^d([0, 1]^2)$ and $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$, the function $\Pi(\Pi(\phi, b), f)$ belongs to $L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$, with the appropriate norm estimate.

We now work with the standard system $\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R})$ of dyadic intervals in $\mathbb{R}$, the Haar basis $(h_I \otimes h_J)_{I, J \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R})} = (h_R)_{R \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}) \times \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R})}$ of $L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$, and the decomposition

$$f = \sum_{j_1=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{j_2=-\infty}^{\infty} \Delta_{\vec{j}} f,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{\vec{j}} f &= \sum_{|I|=2^{-j_1}, |J|=2^{-j_2}} h_I(s) h_J(t) \langle f, h_I \otimes h_J \rangle \\ &= \sum_{R \in \mathcal{D}_{j_1}(\mathbb{R}) \times \mathcal{D}_{j_2}(\mathbb{R})} h_R \langle f, h_R \rangle \text{ for } j_1, j_2 \in \mathbb{Z}. \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$T := \Pi(\Pi(\phi, b), \cdot) = P_{(0,1)^2} T + P_{(0,1) \times (0,1)^c} T + P_{(0,1)^c \times (0,1)} T + P_{(0,1)^c \times (0,1)^c} T,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} P_{(0,1) \times (0,1)} &= \sum_{j_1=0}^{\infty} \sum_{j_2=0}^{\infty} \Delta_{\vec{j}}, \\ P_{(0,1) \times (0,1)^c} &= \sum_{j_1=0}^{\infty} \sum_{j_2=-\infty}^{-1} \Delta_{\vec{j}}, \\ P_{(0,1)^c \times (0,1)} &= \sum_{j_1=-\infty}^{-1} \sum_{j_2=0}^{\infty} \Delta_{\vec{j}}, \\ P_{(0,1)^c \times (0,1)^c} &= \sum_{j_1=-\infty}^{-1} \sum_{j_2=-\infty}^{-1} \Delta_{\vec{j}}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we only need to check the L^2 -boundedness of each of the four terms in the right hand side of the above identity.

The estimate for

$$P_{(0,1)^2} \Pi(\Pi(\phi, b), f) = \Pi(\Pi(P_{(0,1)^2} \phi, b), f)$$

for $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$ is obtained exactly as in the proof of Theorem 2.1, with the help of the growth estimate in Lemma 5.3.

For the fourth term, we observe that with

$$P_{(0,1)^c \times (0,1)^c} \Pi(\Pi(\phi, b), \cdot) = \Pi(\Pi(P_{(0,1)^c \times (0,1)^c} \phi, b), \cdot),$$

we only have to check that for given $\phi \in \text{LMO}^d([0, 1]^2)$ and $b \in \text{BMO}^d([0, 1]^2)$, $P_{(0,1)^c \times (0,1)^c} \Pi(\phi, b)$ belongs to $\text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{R}^2)$. Using the fact that for $R = I \times J \in \mathcal{R}$ with $|I|, |J| \geq 1$, $|m_R b| \lesssim \|b\|_{\text{BMO}}$, one obtains directly that for any open set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$,

$$\|P_\Omega(P_{(0,1)^c \times (0,1)^c} \Pi(\phi, b))\|_2^2 \leq \|P_\Omega \phi\|_2^2 \|b\|_{\text{BMO}}^2,$$

which proves that this term is bounded on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$.

As the second and third terms are symmetric, we only prove the boundedness of the second one. For this, we need to go back to the proof of Theorem 3.2. Again, we use that

$$P_{(0,1) \times (0,1)^c} \Pi(\Pi(\phi, b), \cdot) = \Pi(\Pi(P_{(0,1) \times (0,1)^c} \phi, b), \cdot).$$

LEMMA 5.4. *Let $\phi, b \in \text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{T}^2)$, $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Then*

$$\|\Pi(\Pi(P_{(0,1) \times (0,1)^c} \phi, b), E_k^{(1)})\|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2} \lesssim (k+1) \|\phi\|_{\text{BMO}^d} \|b\|_{\text{BMO}^d}.$$

Proof. We follow the proof of Lemma 3.4. Again we write E for $E^{(1)}$, and σ for $\sigma^{(1)}$. As in Lemma 3.3, we need to estimate

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\sigma_k(\Pi(P_{(0,1) \times (0,1)^c} \phi, b))\|_{\text{BMO}^d} \\ & \leq \|\sigma_k(\Pi(P_{(0,1) \times (0,1)^c} E_k \phi, b))\|_{\text{BMO}^d} + \|\sigma_k(\Pi(P_{(0,1) \times (0,1)^c} Q_k \phi, b))\|_{\text{BMO}^d} \\ & = \|\Pi(P_{(0,1) \times (0,1)^c} E_k \phi, b)\|_{\text{BMO}^d} + \|\sigma_k(\Pi(P_{(0,1) \times (0,1)^c} Q_k \phi, b))\|_{\text{BMO}^d}. \end{aligned}$$

Starting with the first term, we obtain for any open set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{|\Omega|} \|P_\Omega(\Pi(P_{(0,1) \times (0,1)^c} E_k \phi, b))\|_2^2 &= \frac{1}{|\Omega|} \sum_{R=I \times J, |I| > 2^{-k}, |J| > 1, R \subset \Omega} |\phi_R|^2 |m_R b|^2 \\ &\lesssim \frac{(k+1)^2}{|\Omega|} \sum_{R=I \times J, |I| > 2^{-k}, |J| > 1, R \subset \Omega} |\phi_R|^2 \\ &\lesssim (k+1)^2 \|\phi\|_{\text{BMO}^d}^2 \|b\|_{\text{BMO}^d}^2. \end{aligned}$$

where we use Lemma 5.3.

For the second term, we observe that $\sigma_k(\Pi(P_{(0,1) \times (0,1)^c} Q_k \phi, b))$ has only nontrivial coefficients for those rectangles $R = I \times J$ with $|I| = 2^{-k}$ and $|J| > 1$. Hence, it is enough to check the BMO-norm on rectangles $R = I \times J$

with $|I| = 2^{-k}$ and $|J| > 1$. We obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{|R|} \|P_R \sigma_k (\Pi(P_{(0,1) \times (0,1)^c} Q_k \phi, b))\|_2^2 &= \frac{1}{|R|} \sum_{J' \subseteq J} |(\sigma_k (\Pi(P_{(0,1) \times (0,1)^c} Q_k \phi, b)))_{I, J'}|^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{|R|} \sum_{I' \subseteq I} \sum_{J' \subseteq J} |\phi_{I', J'}|^2 |m_{I', J'} b|^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{|R|} \|\Pi(P_R \phi, \chi_R b)\|_2^2 \\
&\lesssim \frac{1}{|R|} \|P_R \phi\|_{\text{BMO}^d} \|\chi_R b\|_2^2 \\
&\lesssim (k+1)^2 \|\phi\|_{\text{BMO}^d}^2 \|b\|_{\text{BMO}^d}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

□

The remainder of the proof of boundedness of $P_{(0,1) \times (0,1)^c} \Pi(\Pi(\phi, b), \cdot)$ follows now with Cotlar's Lemma exactly as in the proof of Theorem 3.2.

□

Before giving our main result of this section, we introduce the space $\text{LMO}([0, 1]^2)$.

DEFINITION 5.5. *Let $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$. We say that $f \in \text{LMO}([0, 1]^2)$ if $\text{supp } f \subseteq [0, 1]^2$, and there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for any $\vec{\alpha} \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$, $\vec{r} \in [1, 2]^2$, and $\vec{j} = (j_1, j_2) \in \mathbb{N}_0 \times \mathbb{N}_0$,*

$$\|Q_{\vec{j}}^{\vec{\alpha}, \vec{r}} f\|_{\text{BMO}^{d, \vec{\alpha}, \vec{r}}([0, 1]^2)} \leq C \frac{1}{(j_1 + 1)(j_2 + 1)}.$$

Here, $Q_{\vec{j}}^{\vec{\alpha}, \vec{r}}$ denotes the projection as in (4), but relative to the dyadic grid $\mathcal{D}^{\vec{\alpha}, \vec{r}}$. More precisely,

$$Q_{\vec{j}}^{\vec{\alpha}, \vec{r}} f(s, t) = \sum_{r_1 |I| \leq 2^{-j_1}, r_2 |J| \leq 2^{-j_2}} \langle f, h_I^{\alpha_1, r_1} h_J^{\alpha_2, r_2} \rangle h_I^{\alpha_1, r_1}(s) h_J^{\alpha_2, r_2}(t),$$

where $h_I^{\alpha_l, r_l}$ is the Haar wavelet adapted to $I \in r_l \mathcal{D}^{\alpha_l}$, $l = 1, 2$.

Clearly, $\text{LMO}([0, 1]^2)$ continuously embeds into $\text{BMO}([0, 1]^2)$. Moreover, if we denote by $\text{LMO}^{d, \vec{\alpha}, \vec{r}}([0, 1]^2)$ the subset of $\text{BMO}^{d, \vec{\alpha}, \vec{r}}([0, 1]^2)$ of functions f such that there exists $C > 0$ with

$$\|Q_{\vec{j}}^{\vec{\alpha}, \vec{r}} f\|_{\text{BMO}^{d, \vec{\alpha}, \vec{r}}([0, 1]^2)} \leq C \frac{1}{(j_1 + 1)(j_2 + 1)} \text{ for any } \vec{j} \in \mathbb{N}_0 \times \mathbb{N}_0,$$

then of course

$$\text{LMO}([0, 1]^2) = \bigcap_{\vec{\alpha} \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}} \times \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}, \vec{r} \in [1, 2]^2} \text{LMO}^{d, \vec{\alpha}, \vec{r}}([0, 1]^2).$$

$\text{LMO}_1([0, 1]^2)$ and $\text{LMO}_2([0, 1]^2)$ along with their dyadic counterparts are defined analogously.

Here is the main result of this section.

THEOREM 5.6. *Let $\phi \in \text{LMO}([0, 1]^2)$. Then*

$$[H_1, [H_2, \phi]] : \text{BMO}([0, 1]^2) \rightarrow \text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^2),$$

is bounded, and $\|[H_1, [H_2, \phi]]\|_{\text{BMO}([0, 1]^2) \rightarrow \text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^2)} \lesssim \|\phi\|_{\text{LMO}([0, 1]^2)}$.

Proof. of Theorem 5.6. We use the representation of the Hilbert transform as averages of dyadic shifts from [12], [7]. Let $S : L^2(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{R})$ be the bounded linear operator defined by $Sh_I = h_{I^+} - h_{I^-}$, $I \in \mathcal{D}$. Define $S^{(1)} = S \otimes \mathbf{1}$, $S^{(2)} = \mathbf{1} \otimes S$, as operators on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^2) = L^2(\mathbb{R}) \otimes L^2(\mathbb{R})$. For the averaging technique, we need to investigate the iterated commutator

$$[S^{(1)}, [S^{(2)}, \phi]].$$

We first prove the following dyadic analogue of the commutator theorem.

THEOREM 5.7. *Let $\phi \in \text{LMO}^d([0, 1]^2)$. Then*

$$[S^{(1)}, [S^{(2)}, \phi]] : \text{BMO}^d([0, 1]^2) \rightarrow \text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{R}^2)$$

is bounded, and $\|[S^{(1)}, [S^{(2)}, \phi]]\|_{\text{BMO}^d([0, 1]^2) \rightarrow \text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{R}^2)} \lesssim \|\phi\|_{\text{LMO}^d([0, 1]^2)}$.

Proof. We formally decompose the multiplication operator with ϕ into 9 parts: $\Pi_\phi, \Delta_\phi, \Pi_{(0,1)}^\phi, \Pi_{(1,0)}^\phi, R_{\Delta_\phi}, R_{\Pi_\phi}, \Delta_{R_\phi}, \Pi_{R_\phi}, R_{R_\phi}$, corresponding to the matrix elements $\langle M_\phi h_I(s) h_J(t), h_{I'}(s) h_{J'}(t) \rangle$ for $I' \subset I$, $I' = I$, $I' \supset I$, $I' \supset I$, $J' \subset J$, $J' = J$, $J' \supset J$. Notice that the operator R denotes the Haar-diagonal part of the multiplication operator.

It is easy to see that $S^{(1)}$ and $S^{(2)}$ are bounded on $\text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{R}^2)$. Thus, after considering Theorems 2.1, 3.2 and symmetry of variables, we are left to consider $[S^{(1)}, [S^{(2)}, R_{R_\phi}]]$, $[S^{(1)}, [S^{(2)}, \Pi_{R_\phi}]]$, $[S^{(1)}, [S^{(2)}, \Delta_{R_\phi}]]$.

We recall that

$$R_{R_\phi} b(s, t) = \sum_{I, J} b_{IJ} m_{IJ}(\phi) h_I(s) h_J(t),$$

$$\Pi_{R_\phi} b(s, t) = \sum_{I, J} m_J(\phi_I) m_I(b_J) h_I(s) h_J(t)$$

and

$$\Delta_{R_\phi} b(s, t) = \sum_{I, J} m_J(\phi_I) b_{I, J} h_I(s) h_J^2(t).$$

We start with $[S^{(1)}, [S^{(2)}, R_{R_\phi}]]$. One verifies that

$$\begin{aligned} [S^{(1)}, [S^{(2)}, R_{R_\phi}]] h_{IJ} &= (m_{I, J\phi} - m_{I^+, J\phi} - m_{I, J^+\phi} + m_{I^+, J^+\phi}) h_{I^+, J^+} \\ &\quad + (m_{I, J\phi} - m_{I^+, J\phi} - m_{I, J^-\phi} + m_{I^+, J^-\phi}) h_{I^+, J^-} \\ &\quad + (m_{I, J\phi} - m_{I^-, J\phi} - m_{I, J^-\phi} + m_{I^-, J^+\phi}) h_{I^-, J^+} \\ &\quad + (m_{I, J\phi} - m_{I^-, J\phi} - m_{I, J^-\phi} + m_{I^-, J^-\phi}) h_{I^-, J^-}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $[S^{(1)}, [S^{(2)}, R_{R_\phi}]]$ preserves the orthogonality of the Haar system $(h_{I, J})_{I, J \in \mathcal{D}}$. Letting $\tilde{\phi} = E_{k+1, l+1} \phi$ for $|I| = 2^{-k}$, $|J| = 2^{-l}$, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \|[S^{(1)}, [S^{(2)}, R_{R_\phi}]] h_{IJ}\|_2^2 &= \frac{1}{|I||J|} \|\tilde{\phi}(s, t) - m_I \tilde{\phi}(t) - m_J \tilde{\phi}(s) + m_{I \times J} \tilde{\phi}\|_2^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{|I||J|} \|P_{I \times J} \tilde{\phi}\|_2^2 \leq \frac{1}{|I||J|} \|P_{I \times J} \phi\|_2^2 \leq \|\phi\|_{\text{BMO}_{rect}^d}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence for $b = \sum_{I,J \in \mathcal{D}} h_{I,J} b_{I,J} \in \text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{R}^2)$, $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$ open,

$$\begin{aligned} \|P_\Omega[S^{(1)}, [S^{(2)}, R_{R\phi}]]b\|_2^2 &\leq \| [S^{(1)}, [S^{(2)}, R_{R\phi}]] P_{\tilde{\Omega}} b \|_2^2 \\ &\leq \sum_{I \times J \in \tilde{\Omega}} \|\phi\|_{\text{BMO}_{rect}^d(\mathbb{R}^2)}^2 |b_{I,J}|^2 \\ &\leq \|\phi\|_{\text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{R}^2)_{rect}}^2 \|b\|_{\text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{R}^2)}^2 |\tilde{\Omega}| \\ &\leq 4 \|\phi\|_{\text{BMO}^d([0,1]^2)}^2 \|b\|_{\text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{R}^2)}^2 |\Omega|, \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{\Omega} = \cup_{I,J \in \mathcal{D}, I \times J \subseteq \Omega} \tilde{I} \times \tilde{J}$ and $\tilde{I}, \tilde{J}$ are the parents of I, J . Thus

$$(12) \quad \| [S^{(1)}, [S^{(2)}, R_{R\phi}]] \|_{\text{BMO}^d([0,1]^2) \rightarrow \text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{R}^2)} \leq 2 \|\phi\|_{\text{BMO}_{rect}^d([0,1]^2)}.$$

Here $\text{BMO}_{rect}^d(\mathbb{R}^2)$ is the dyadic rectangular BMO space which continuously contains $\text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and consists of function $f \in L_0^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$ such that

$$\sup_{I \times J \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}^2)} \|P_{I \times J} f\| = \sup_{I \times J \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}^2)} \frac{1}{|I||J|} \|f(s,t) - m_I f(t) - m_J f(s) + m_{I \times J} f\|_2^2 < \infty.$$

For the boundedness of $[S^{(1)}, [S^{(2)}, \Pi_{R\phi}]]$ and $[S^{(1)}, [S^{(2)}, \Delta_{R\phi}]]$ from $\text{BMO}^d([0,1]^2)$ to $\text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{R}^2)$, we remark that since $S^{(1)}$ is bounded on $\text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{R}^2)$, we only need to show that $[S^{(2)}, \Delta_{R\phi}]$ and $[S^{(2)}, \Pi_{R\phi}]$ are bounded from $\text{BMO}^d([0,1]^2)$ to $\text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{R}^2)$.

Straightforward computations give us for $b \in \text{BMO}^d([0,1]^2)$,

$$\begin{aligned} [S^{(2)}, \Delta_{R\phi}](b)(s,t) &= \sum_{I,J} b_{IJ} \phi_{IJ} h_I^2(s) \frac{h_{J-}(t) - h_{J+}(t)}{|J|^{1/2}} \\ &= \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} \sum_{I,J} b_{IJ} \phi_{IJ} h_I^2(s) \left(\frac{\chi_{J-+}(t)}{|J-+|} - \frac{\chi_{J--}(t)}{|J--|} - \frac{\chi_{J++}(t)}{|J++|} + \frac{\chi_{J+-}(t)}{|J+-|} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} \Delta_{\tilde{\phi}}(\tilde{b})(s,t), \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{b}(s,t) = \sum_{I,J} b_{IJ} h_I(s) (h_{J-+}(t) - h_{J--}(t) - h_{J++}(t) + h_{J+-}(t))$ and $\tilde{\phi} = \sum_{I,J} \phi_{IJ} h_I(s) (h_{J-+}(t) - h_{J--}(t) - h_{J++}(t) + h_{J+-}(t))$.

We obtain in the same way

$$\begin{aligned} [S^{(2)}, \Pi_{R\phi}](b)(s,t) &= \sum_{I,J} \phi_{IJ} m_I(b_J) h_I(s) \frac{h_{J-}(t) - h_{J+}(t)}{|J|^{1/2}} \\ &= \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} \sum_{I,J} \phi_{IJ} m_I(b_J) h_I(s) \left(\frac{\chi_{J-+}(t)}{|J-+|} - \frac{\chi_{J--}(t)}{|J--|} - \frac{\chi_{J++}(t)}{|J++|} + \frac{\chi_{J+-}(t)}{|J+-|} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} \Pi_{\Delta_{\tilde{\phi}}}(\tilde{b})(s). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\|\tilde{b}\|_{\text{BMO}^d([0,1]^2)} \lesssim \|b\|_{\text{BMO}^d([0,1]^2)}$ and $\|\tilde{\phi}\|_{\text{LMO}_1^d([0,1]^2)} \lesssim \|\phi\|_{\text{LMO}_1^d([0,1]^2)}$, we obtain

$$(13) \quad \| [S^{(1)}, [S^{(2)}, \Delta_{R\phi}]] \|_{\text{BMO}^d([0,1]^2) \rightarrow \text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{R}^2)} \lesssim \|\phi\|_{\text{BMO}^d([0,1]^2)}$$

and

$$(14) \quad \| [S^{(1)}, [S^{(2)}, \Pi_{R\phi}]] \|_{\text{BMO}^d([0,1]^2) \rightarrow \text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{R}^2)} \lesssim \|\phi\|_{\text{LMO}_1^d([0,1]^2)}$$

by Theorem 3.2. Swapping variables yields

$$(15) \quad \|[S^{(1)}, [S^{(2)}, R_{\Delta\phi}]]\|_{\text{BMO}^d([0,1]^2) \rightarrow \text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{R}^2)} \lesssim \|\phi\|_{\text{BMO}^d([0,1]^2)}$$

and

$$(16) \quad \|[S^{(1)}, [S^{(2)}, R_{\Pi\phi}]]\|_{\text{BMO}^d([0,1]^2) \rightarrow \text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{R}^2)} \lesssim \|\phi\|_{\text{LMO}_2^d([0,1]^2)}.$$

This finishes the proof of Theorem 5.7. $\square$

To finish the proof of Theorem 5.6, we need to consider the relation between $\text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and $\text{BMO}^d(\mathbb{R}^N)$ established in [13, 18].

Let us momentarily return to the one-variable setting and recall the following result which simplifies the one in [12].

THEOREM 5.8. (*Theorem 1.1 of [7]*) *For $r \in [1, 2)$ and $\beta \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$, let $S^{\beta, r}$ be the dyadic shift associated to the dyadic system $r\mathcal{D}^\beta$. Let μ stand for the canonical probability measure on $\{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ which makes the coordinate functions β_j independent with $\mu(\beta_j = 0) = \mu(\beta_j = 1) = 1/2$. Then for all $p \in (1, \infty)$ and $f \in L^p(\mathbb{R})$,*

$$(17) \quad Hf(x) = -\frac{8}{\pi} \int_1^2 \int_{\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}} S^{\beta, r} f(x) d\mu(\beta) \frac{dr}{r},$$

where the integral converges both pointwise for a.e. $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and also in the sense of an $L^p(\mathbb{R})$ -valued Bochner integral.

Returning to the two-variable setting, we obtain for $b \in \text{BMO}([0, 1]^2)$, $\phi \in \text{LMO}([0, 1]^2)$:

$$[H_1, [H_2, \phi]]b = \frac{64}{\pi^2} \int_1^2 \int_1^2 \int_{\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}} \int_{\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}} [S^{\alpha^1, r_1}, [S^{\alpha^2, r_2}, \phi]] b d\mu(\alpha^1) \frac{dr_1}{r_1} d\mu(\alpha^2) \frac{dr_2}{r_2}.$$

Now since $b \in \text{BMO}([0, 1]^2)$, $\phi \in \text{LMO}([0, 1]^2)$, we have that $b \in \text{BMO}^{d, \vec{\alpha}, \vec{r}}(\mathbb{R}^2)$, and $\phi \in \text{LMO}^{d, \vec{\alpha}, \vec{r}}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ for each $\vec{\alpha} = (\alpha^1, \alpha^2) \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}} \times \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ and $\vec{r} = (r_1, r_2) \in [1, 2)^2$ with uniformly bounded norm (see e. g. [6]). Thus there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\|[S^{\alpha^1, r_1}, [S^{\alpha^2, r_2}, \phi]]b\|_{\text{BMO}^{d, \vec{\alpha}, \vec{r}}} \leq C \|b\|_{\text{BMO}} \|\phi\|_{\text{LMO}} \text{ for all } (\alpha^1, \alpha^2, r_1, r_2)$$

by Theorem 5.7. By [18], Remark 0.5 (see also [13]), it follows that

$$\frac{64}{\pi^2} \int_1^2 \int_1^2 \int_{\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}} \int_{\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}} [S^{\alpha^1, r_1}, [S^{\alpha^2, r_2}, \phi]] b d\mu(\alpha^1) \frac{dr_1}{r_1} d\mu(\alpha^2) \frac{dr_2}{r_2} \in \text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^2)$$

with norm controlled by $\|b\|_{\text{BMO}} \|\phi\|_{\text{LMO}}$. The proof is complete. $\square$

6. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is a pleasure to thank Aline Bonami for many very useful discussions and comments. Prof Bonami's visit at the University of Glasgow was made possible through a grant of the Edinburgh Mathematical Society. The authors also gratefully acknowledge support of the Fields Institute of Mathematical Sciences and the "Thematic Program on New Trends in Harmonic Analysis", where part of this work was completed.

REFERENCES

- [1] O. BLASCO, S. POTT, *Dyadic BMO on the bidisc*, Rev. Math. Iberoamericana 21 (2005), no. 2, 483-510.
- [2] S-Y. A. CHANG, *Carleson measure on the bi-disc*, Ann. of Math. (2) 109 (1979), no. 3, 613-620.
- [3] S-Y. A. CHANG AND R. FEFFERMAN, *A continuous version of H^1 duality with BMO on the bidisc*, Ann. of Math. (2) 112 (1980), no. 1, 179-201.
- [4] S-Y. A. CHANG AND R. FEFFERMAN, *Some recent developments in Fourier analysis and H^p theory on product domains*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. 12 (1985), 1-43.
- [5] S. FERGUSON, C. SADOSKY, *Characterizations of bounded mean oscillation on the polydisk in terms of Hankel operators and Carleson measures*, J. Anal. Math. 81 (2000), 239-267.
- [6] S. H. FERGUSON, M. T. LACEY, *A characterization of product BMO by commutators*, Acta Math. 189(2002), no. 2, 143-160.
- [7] T. HYTÖNEN, *On Petermichl's dyadic shift and the Hilbert transform*, C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris 346 (2008), no. 21-22, 1133-1136.
- [8] S. JANSON, J. PEETRE, S. SEMMES, *On the action of Hankel and Toeplitz operators on some function spaces*, Duke Math. J. 51(1984), no. 4, 937-958.
- [9] M. T. LACEY, J. METCALFE, *Paraproducts in one and several variables*, Forum Math. 19 (2007), no. 2, 325 - 351.
- [10] M. T. LACEY, E. TERWILLEGER, *Hankel operators in several complex variables and product BMO*, Houston J. Math. 35 (2009), no. 1, 159 -183.
- [11] C. MUSCALU, J. PIPHER, T. TAO, C. THIELE *Bi-parameter paraproducts*, Acta Math. 193 (2004), no. 2, 269-296.
- [12] S. PETERMICHL, *Dyadic shifts and a logarithmic estimate for Hankel operators with matrix symbol*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math. 330 (6) (2000) 455-460.
- [13] J. PIPHER, L. A. WARD, *BMO from dyadic BMO on the bidisc*. J. Lond. Math. Soc. (2) 77 (2008), no. 2, 524-544..
- [14] S. Pott, B. Sehba *The Multiplier Algebra on product BMO*. Preprint.
- [15] S. Pott, C. Sadosky, *Bounded mean oscillation on the bidisk and operator BMO*, J. Funct. Anal. 189(2002), no. 2, 475-495.
- [16] B. F. SEHBA, *Operators on some analytic function spaces and their dyadic counterparts*, Ph.D 2009, University of Glasgow.
- [17] D. A. Stegenga, *Bounded Toeplitz operators on H^1 and applications of the duality between H^1 and the functions of bounded mean oscillation*, Amer. J. Math. 98 (1976), no. 3, 573-589.
- [18] S. Treil, *H^1 and dyadic H^1* . Linear and complex analysis, 179193, Amer. Math. Soc. Transl. Ser. 2, 226, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2009.
- [19] R. Zhao, *On logarithmic Carleson measures*, Acta Sci. Math (Szeged) 69 (2003), no 3-4, 605-618.

SANDRA POTT, CENTRE FOR MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, FACULTY OF SCIENCE, LUND UNIVERSITY, 22100 LUND, SWEDEN
E-mail address: `sandra.pott@math.lu.se`

BENOÎT SEHBA, SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, TRINITY COLLEGE, DUBLIN 2, IRELAND.
E-mail address: `sehbab@tcd.ie`